

REMARKS

Claims 5, 6, 9 and 12 remain herein. Claims 1-4, 7, 8, 10 and 11 also remain herein, but are currently withdrawn from consideration.

1. Claims 5, 6 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) over Honma '848.

Honma '848 fails to disclose or suggest "wherein said quantizer is for quantizing the frequency components up to the position indicated by the control signal in the predetermined scanning order," as recited in claim 5. While the Office Action cites Figs. 17 and 19 of Honma '848 as describing such elements of claim 5, the cited portion of Honma '848 fails to disclose or suggest a quantizer. See Honma '848 col. 21, line 20 – col. 22, line 24. At most, the cited figures describe EOB detecting circuits 804a-804d. See Honma '848, Fig. 18. While Honma '848 describes a quantizer in an embodiment different from the one cited in the Office Action, that quantizer is not connected to an EOB detector, as recited in applicants' claim 5. See Honma '848, Fig. 14, col. 18, lines 41-49.

Claim 6 should be patentable over Honma '848 by virtue of its dependency from claim 5.

Claim 9 similarly recites, "quantizing the frequency components up to said position in the predetermined scanning order, and pausing the quantization thereafter." As discussed above with respect to claim 5, Honma '848 fails to disclose or suggest a quantizer connected to an EOB detector. Thus, claim 9 should be patentable over Honma '848.

Thus, there is no disclosure or teaching in Honma '848 of all elements of applicants' presently claimed invention. Accordingly, Honma '848 is not an adequate basis for rejection of applicants' claims under § 102. Nor is there any disclosure in Honma '848 that would have suggested applicants' claimed invention to one of ordinary skill in this art.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5, 6, 9 and 12 is respectfully requested.

2. Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) over Honma '848 and Kobayashi '408. Kobayashi '408 is cited only as allegedly describing an image encoding method on a computer readable medium, and thus, Kobayashi '408 fails to disclose what is missing in Honma '848, as noted above with respect to claim 5. Thus, claim 12 is patentable over Honma '848 and Kobayashi '408.

Accordingly, the application is now fully in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested. The PTO is hereby authorized to charge/credit any fee deficiencies or overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-4293. If further amendments would place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is invited to call applicant's undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP



Roger W. Parkhurst
Reg. No. 25,177
Daniel W. Shim
Reg. No. 56,995

Date: December 31, 2007

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP
1330 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036-1795
Tel: (202) 429-3000
Fax: (202) 429-3902

Attorney Docket No.: 28951.1134